

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0409

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes new Figure 5. Figure 5 was added to illustrate a bi-centered bit as discussed in the remarks section of the response.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Page 6

390772_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0409

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated May 23, 2005 and the Advisory Action dated August 17, 2005, the Examiner stated that claims 25-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, Applicant has amended claim 22 to include the limitations of claim 25. Additionally, Applicant has rewritten claim 26 as new claim 35. Therefore, Applicant believes amended claim 22 and new claim 35 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, claims 23-24 and 27-28 depend from claim 22. Therefore, Applicant believes claims 23-24 and 27-28 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. According to the Examiner, the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to page 2, lines 29-30, and page 3, lines 1-4, where it states in part "As used herein the term "rotary drill bit" means any bit that is rotated to create a borehole in subterranean earthen materials. Examples of such rotary drill bits include rolling cutter rock bits.....bi-centrix bits having sections with differing centers of rotation for drilling boreholes larger than the true diameter of the drill bit, and the like well known to those skilled in the art." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 31 and 32 be removed.

In the Advisory Action dated August 17, 2005, the Examiner stated that claims 31 and 32 are allowed.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because a bi-centered bit with first and second sets of cutting elements as recited in claims 31-32 must be shown. In response, Applicant has added Figure 5 to illustrate a bi-centered bit

Page 7

390772_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0409


with first and second sets of cutting elements. Applicant submits no new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the objection to the drawings be removed.

All claims being allowable, Applicant reserves discussion of the references cited by the Examiner for a future continuation application.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the final office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the same be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant